

Remarks

The Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment mailed on August 10, 2011 has been reviewed. Claim 14 has been amended to correct an informality. In compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.111, Applicants submit these remarks to support the assertion that claim 45, as submitted on June 2, 2011, is patentable.

The remarks submitted in the previous Response dated June 2, 2011 with respect to claim 1 and the disclosures of Wiser similarly apply to claim 45. With respect to claim 45, Wiser fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a stream caster and a stream routing processor as claimed. In particular, Wiser fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a stream caster to create at least one information block for a session, wherein the information block comprises the reservation identification, an identification of streamed media, and at least one member of a group consisting of a presentation identification, a media server identification, a stream caster identification, a media player identification, and a data packet path identification.

In the Office action mailed on December 2, 2010, the Examiner asserts that the “content manager 112 and deliver server 118 combine to perform the functions of the claimed stream caster and therefore are a “stream caster” as defined by the applicant.” (See Office action, page 3). In addition, the Examiner cited col. 19, lines 4-7 of Wiser to equate a keyed MAC of the voucher ID in Wiser to the claimed reservation identification for the request. As submitted in the Response dated June 2, 2011, Applicants respectfully disagree and submits that the keyed MAC of Wiser is not a reservation identification of the request, i.e. an identification of a reservation for the request for media.

In addition, Applicants reiterate the Applicants’ belief that the Examiner has improperly combined the functionality of the content manager and delivery server, as Wiser explicitly teaches away from such a combination. Applicants submit that Wiser teaches a separation between the content management components and the delivery components that store the media. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the two sets of components, thus any such combination would be nonobvious in view of Wiser. Therefore, Wiser fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a stream caster to create at least one information block for a session, wherein the information block comprises the reservation identification, an identification of streamed media, and at least one member of a group consisting of a presentation identification, a media server

identification, a stream caster identification, a media player identification, and a data packet path identification, as claimed in claim 45.

Based on the foregoing and the remarks submitted in the previous Response and the Supplemental Response dated June 2, 2011, and June 3, 2011, respectively, Applicants submit that 1-58, 60-102, and 107-134 are patentable over the references of record. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicants' attorney welcomes the opportunity to discuss the case with the Examiner in the event that there are any questions or comments regarding the response or the application.

This is intended to be a complete response to the Examiner's Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment mailed on August 10, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI SHUGHART PC

/Elton F. Dean III/

Elton F. Dean III, Reg. No. 63,316
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 1000
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
Tel: (314) 622-6632
Fax: (314) 231-1776
Attorney for Applicants